

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO**

**JOHN NOAKES,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI, *et*  
*al.*,**

**Defendants.**

**: Case No. 1:23-cv-00284**  
**:**  
**: Judge Michael R. Barrett**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**  
**:**

**DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE OF COURT TO EXCEED PAGE  
LIMITATION FOR MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS**

Defendants University of Cincinnati (“UC”), Alecia Trammer, Adrienne Lyles, Bleuzette Marshall, and Ashleigh Wade (“Defendants”) move this Court for leave to exceed the twenty (20) page limitation placed upon memoranda in support of motions by S.D. Ohio L.R. 7.2(a)(3) and Section I(G) of this Court’s Standing Orders.

On May 15, 2023, Plaintiff John Noakes filed a 65-page Complaint against Defendants. (Complaint, Doc. 1). In Count I, Plaintiff alleges that he is entitled to monetary damages for violation of his rights under Title IX. (*Id.* ¶¶ 119-128, PageID #54-58). In Count II, Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief for violations of due process. (*Id.* ¶¶ 129-139, PageID #58-61). In Count III, Plaintiff seeks a judgment declaring that UC’s “Title IX Policy is invalid because the rule had not been filed as required by R.C. 111.15” and that “any disciplinary proceedings held in accordance with the Title IX policy, and that deviated from the Student Code of Conduct, are invalid because the rule had not been filed as required by R.C. 111.15.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 140-150, PageID #61-62). In Count IV, Plaintiff seeks a judgment declaring that “the discipline imposed by UC was contrary to the school’s policies and the Ohio Administrative Code and, therefore, invalid.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 151-162, PageID #63-64).

The Complaint contains numerous factual allegations against Defendants, requests various forms of relief, and asserts legal claims implicating federal and state law. Defendants are prepared to submit a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint in its entirety. Defendants respectfully submit that exceeding the 20-page limitation for the memorandum in support the motion is necessary to allow Defendants to adequately address all of Plaintiff's claims and to fully develop the arguments for dismissal in a manner helpful to the Court. Accordingly, pursuant to Section I(G) of this Court's Standing Orders and S.D. Ohio L.R. 7.2(a)(3), Defendants respectfully request that the Court extend the page limitation to 35 pages for their memorandum in support.

Pursuant to S.D. Ohio L.R. 7.3, counsel for Defendants has contacted counsel for Plaintiff, and counsel for Plaintiff has stated that he has no objection to this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Dominick S. Gerace  
Dominick S. Gerace (0082823)  
Jada M. Colon (0099048)  
Taft Stettinius & Hollister LLP  
425 Walnut Street, Suite 1800  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-3957  
Telephone: (513) 381-2838  
Fax: (513) 381-0205  
dgerace@taftlaw.com  
jcolon@taftlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on July 6, 2023, I filed the foregoing using the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send electronic notice of such filing to all parties of record.

/s/ Dominick S. Gerace